

<p align="center">Interview Summary</p>	Application No. 10/552,087	Applicant(s) TAO ET AL.	
	Examiner Xiuyu Tai	Art Unit 1795	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Xiuyu Tai (3) _____

(2) Andrew Dirisio (4) _____

Date of Interview: 09 June 2009

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: pending claims

Identification of prior art discussed: none

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Dirisio pointed out that the Final rejection mailed on 5/26/2009 was not proper because the filed affidavit under rule 1.131 could overcome the reference of Yan. The examiner indicated to reconsider the matter and issue a new office action.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

(Alexa D. Neckel/
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795